

Appl. No. 10/605,585  
Amendment dated July 31, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of May 14, 2008

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheets of drawings include change to Figures 1A and 7. These sheets, which includes Figures 1A, 1B and 7, and replaces the original sheets including Figures 1A, 1B and 7. Specifically, Figure 1A has been changed to include reference characters  $S_1$ ,  $S_2$  and B in order to identify the upper surface  $S_1$ , the lower surface  $S_2$  and boundaries B.

Attachment: two (2) replacement sheet

### **REMARKS**

In the May 14, 2008 Office Action, claims 15, 17 and 22 were withdrawn from further consideration, claims 14, 16 and 18-21 were rejected in view of prior art. No other objections or rejections were made in the Office Action.

#### ***Status of Claims and Amendments***

In response to the May 14, 2008 Office Action, Applicants have amended the specification to include additional reference characters, cancelled withdrawn claims 15, 17 and 22, and amended claims 14, 16 and 18-21, as indicated above. Thus, claims 14, 16 and 18-21 are pending, with claim 1 being the only independent claim. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested in view of above amendments and the following comments.

#### ***Drawings***

Figure 1A has been changed to include reference characters S<sub>1</sub>, S<sub>2</sub> and B and Figure 7 has been changed to include the reference character B in order to identify the upper surface S<sub>1</sub> and the lower surface S<sub>2</sub> of the semiconductor substrate 100 and the boundaries B between the main unit 105 and the thin portion 210.

Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been introduced by virtue of these amendments since the identified features are clearly shown in the drawings as originally filed.

### *Specification*

Applicants have amended the specification to include mention of the reference characters added to Figures 1A and 7.

Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been introduced by virtue of these amendments since the identified features are clearly shown in the drawings as originally filed.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112*

Beginning in the middle of page 2 of the Office Action, claims 16 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. In response, Applicants have amended claims 16 and 21 to clarify claims 16 and 21, as set forth above.

Applicants believe that the claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

### *Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102*

Beginning at the top of page 3 of the Office Action, claims 14 and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,049,460 (herein after “the Benecke et al. patent”). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 14 to clearly define the present invention over the prior art of record.

In particular, independent claim 14 has been amended to recite that the semiconductor substrate of the semiconductor device requires *a first surface that is planar and extends continuously along both the main unit and the thin portion*. Claim 14 goes on to require that the first wiring has *a first sub-wiring extending from the main unit to the thin portion on the first surface of the semiconductor substrate in a direction perpendicular to a*

*boundary between the main unit and the thin portion, and a second sub-wiring connected to the first sub-wiring and extending parallel to the boundary between the main unit and thin portion.*

The Benecke et al. patent fails to disclose each and every element required by amended independent claim 14. Specifically, the Benecke et al. patent fails to disclose a first sub wiring that extends *from the main unit to the thin portion on the first surface of the semiconductor substrate in a direction perpendicular to a boundary between the main unit and the thin portion, and a second sub-wiring connected to the first sub-wiring and extending parallel to the boundary between the main unit and thin portion.*

It is well settled under U.S. patent law that for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must disclose each and every element of the claim within the reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14, as now amended, is not anticipated by the prior art of record. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the dependent claim 16 and 18-21 are also allowable over the prior art of record in that they depend from independent claim 14, and therefore are allowable for the reasons stated above. Also, the dependent claims 16 and 18-21 are further allowable because they include additional limitations. Thus, Applicants believe that since the prior art of record does not anticipate the independent claim 14, neither does the prior art anticipate the dependent claims.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

### ***Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Beginning in the middle of page 5 of the Office Action, claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Benecke et al. patent in view of U.S.

Patent No. 6,107,109 (hereinafter “the Akram et al. patent”). In response, Applicants have amended independent claim 14 as mentioned above.

Applicants respectfully assert that claim 16 is allowable in that it depends from allowable independent claim 16.

However, Applicants incorporate herein the comments above with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Further, Applicants note that independent claim 14 recites that the semiconductor substrate of the semiconductor device requires *a first surface that is planar and extends continuously along both the main unit and the thin portion* where a first sub wiring extends *from the main unit to the thin portion on the first surface of the semiconductor substrate in a direction perpendicular to a boundary between the main unit and the thin portion, and a second sub-wiring connected to the first sub-wiring and extending parallel to the boundary between the main unit and thin portion.*

The claimed structure is *not* disclosed or suggested by the Benecke et al. patent, the Akram et al. patent or any other prior art of record. It is well settled in U.S. patent law that the mere fact that the prior art can be modified does *not* make the modification obvious, unless the prior art provides an *apparent reason* for the desirability of the modification. Accordingly, the prior art of record lacks any apparent reason, suggestion or expectation of success for combining the patents to create the Applicants’ unique arrangement of a semiconductor device.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the above comments and amendments.

\* \* \*

Appl. No. 10/605,585  
Amendment dated July 31, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of May 14, 2008

In view of the foregoing amendment and comments, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 14, 16 and 18-21 are now in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/John C. Robbins/  
John C. Robbins  
Reg. No. 34,706

GLOBAL IP COUNSELORS, LLP  
1233 Twentieth Street, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202)-293-0444  
Dated: July 31, 2008

S:\07-JUL08-SOS\RM-US020052 Amendment OA.doc